

connectionless mode of communication but Internet mail uses TCP for communication and TCP is a connection-mode of operation.

In response to Examiner Luu's concerns, it is explained that while a portion of Internet electronic mail uses a TCP connection which is a connection-mode of communication, there is not established a connection between the sender and receiver of the electronic mail message. The manner of communicating over the Internet is explained on page 7 of the originally filed specification which specifically refers to the book "TCP/IP Illustrated," Vol. 1. Included herewith as an Appendix are pages 441-452 of this book. It is shown on page 441 in Figure 28.1 that a connection is established between the two message transfer agents. However, there is no connection established between the user at the sending terminal and the user at the receiving terminal. Thus, Figure 28.1 clearly illustrates a connectionless-mode of communication between the user terminal and the receiver terminal because a connection is never established between these two terminals.

Additionally, as indicated on page 446, most Internet electronic mail systems today use the system as illustrated in Figure 28.3 in which relay message transfer agents are used. In Figure 28.3 set forth on page 447, a direct connection may be established between the relay MTAs, but a direct connection is not established between the sending host and the receiving host. From the above explanation, it should be clear that a connection is never established between a sender and a receiver of email, even though the transmission process will typically involve at least one connection mode of communication (e.g., the TCP connection between the message transfer agents). As a connection is never established between the sending terminal and the receiving terminal of Internet electronic mail, it is accurate and correct to describe the communication between these two devices as being a connectionless-mode of

communication. The Amendment to the specification includes known information from the books referred to in the originally filed specification which is inherent to the present invention. Therefore, the added material does not constitute new matter.

Accordingly, it is asserted that the specification and claims are accurate and there is properly recited a connectionless-mode of communication.

Regarding the prior art rejection, it was explained during the interview by Mr. Kulbaski that the prior art of record simply does not show the transmission of information obtained from sensors as an Internet electronic mail message over the Internet. In response to this assertion, during the interview Examiner Luu asserted that such a concept was well known. As there is no prior art of record showing that this concept is well known, Examiner Luu is respectfully requested to provide prior art which shows that this claimed concept is known or to withdraw the prior art rejection.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
James J. Kulbaski
Attorney
Registration No. 34,648

Crystal Square Five, 4th Fl.
1755 South Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202
(703) 413-3000 Fax #: (703) 413-2220
JJK/gms I:\attyJK\52440051.AM3.wpd